## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

NATIONAL CIVIC COMMITTEE and FA'DEE MULAZIM,

Plaintiffs.

v.

CASE NO. 09-13976 HONORABLE ARTHUR J. TARNOW MAGISTRATE JUDGE BINDER

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, PATRICIA CARUSO, and MDOC CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES,

1 )	$^{-1}$	er	1	01	n	Łα	

/

## ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

On October 8, 2009, plaintiff Fa'Dee Mulzazim filed a *pro se* complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and related statutes. He sought to implement conjugal visits in correctional facilities, and he alleged that correctional officials had deprived him of a single-occupancy cell. He also complained that prison officials had taken his legal property, transferred him to a different facility, and failed to use disinfectant in prison restrooms.

Plaintiff did not pay the filing fee for his complaint, and on November 20, 2009, the Court summarily dismissed the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Court noted that three or more of Plaintiff's prior complaints were dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim, and that Plaintiff had failed to show he was in imminent danger of serious physical injury.

Mulazim v. Mich. Dep't of Corr., No. 09-13976

Currently pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction and

a temporary restraining order. The motion seeks an order authorizing Melanic religious worship

and meditation, granting Melanic vendor rights, granting a Melanic vegan diet, enjoining the

illegal denial of Plaintiff's right to property, and enjoining the Michigan Department of

Corrections from maintaining a false prison debt.

Temporary restraining orders "have the modest purpose of preserving the status quo to

give the court time to determine whether a preliminary injunction should issue." Workman v.

Bredesen, 486 F.3d 896, 922 (6th Cir. 2007). "The purpose of a preliminary injunction is merely

to preserve the relative positions of the parties until a trial on the merits can be held." *University* 

of Texas v. Camenisch, 451 U.S. 390, 395 (1981).

Plaintiff's case is closed; therefore, his motion is moot. Furthermore, the allegations in

the pending motion have not persuaded the Court to reconsider its order of dismissal and to re-

open this case. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction and a temporary

restraining order [Dkt. #7] is **DENIED**.

S/Arthur J. Tarnow

Arthur J. Tarnow

United States District Judge

Dated: October 8, 2010

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon parties/counsel of record

on October 8, 2010, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Catherine A. Pickles

**Judicial Secretary** 

2